

### **REMARKS**

The present application presents one or more claims rejected in a final office action mailed October 23, 2003 in parent application serial no. 09/918,482, filed August 1, 2001, from which the present application claims priority. The Applicant thus presents these remarks to further prosecution on the merits of the claims presented in this continuation application.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, “the calibration grid is non-uniform, and the calibration grid comprises a first area of a first calibration density and a second area of a second calibration density different from said first calibration density.” None of the previously cited prior art from the parent application, namely Fukuda (US 2003/0056999 A1) and/or Babb (U.S. Pat. No. 5,940,065), teach or suggest this aspect of claim 1.

Fukuda describes a system whereby only four calibration points are used (Fukuda, para. 26), and therefore uses only one calibration density. While Babb describes a common alignment correction algorithm that accounts for nonlinear variations and manufacturing variations in the touchscreen (Babb, col. 5, line 50 – col. 6, line 10), Babb does not contemplate providing a first area of a first calibration density and a second area of a second calibration density different from said first calibration density, based on distortion levels within a data processing device, as is contemplated by the present invention, and a non-limiting example of which is illustrated in Figure 6B of the present application. By using areas of differing densities, the present invention can account for distortion caused by more than merely manufacturing defects, e.g., by correcting distortion caused by devices with known locations near the touch screen (see specification, ¶ 40). Claim 1 and its respective dependent claims are thus allowable over Fukuda and/or Babb.

Independent claim 6 similarly recites “the calibration grid is non-uniform, and comprises a first area of a first density and a second area of a second density.” Claim 6 and its respective dependent claims are thus allowable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 10 similarly recites “the calibration grid is non-uniform, and the calibration grid comprises a first area of a first calibration density and a second area of a second calibration density different from said first calibration density.” Claim 10 and its respective dependent claims are thus allowable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Independent claim 16 similarly recites “said array of points is non-uniform, and has a first area of a first calibration density and a second area of a second calibration density different

Appln. No.: Continuation of 09/918,482  
Preliminary Amendment dated March 15, 2004

from said first calibration density.” Claim 16 and its respective dependent claims are thus allowable for similar reasons as claim 1. In addition, neither Fukuda nor Babb teach or suggest a data structure as claimed in claim 16.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 15 day of Mar., 2004

By:

  
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001  
RAD/mmd